

## **Did Saṃskṛta oppress non-Saṃskṛta languages because of nexus between Saṃskṛta scholars and kings ?**

**S.Jagannatha, Mysore**

That Saṃskṛta scholars, being arrogant, because of their having patronage of kings oppressed non-Saṃskṛta languages is simply false. Facts are listed here: 1.Many Saṃskṛta scholars/poets were not patronized by any king.2.Sometimes the kings got angry with scholars/ became indifferent to the scholars. 3.The cases are not rare where Saṃskṛta poets expressed their displeasure regarding the behavior of the kings.4.All the Saṃskṛta poets were not rich. 5.Many Saṃskṛta scholars composed works in non-Saṃskṛta languages. 6. Some kings patronized only non-Saṃskṛta poets. 7.We can not say that sycophantic statements centering on kings available only in Saṃskṛta. 8.The expression *saṃskṛtaṃ devabhāṣā* is nothing but Saṃskṛta-loving expression. 9.Statements of praising Non-Saṃskṛta languages are available in old literature. 10.Some scholars were of the view that we have to respect all the languages without leaning towards any single language. 11.Non-Saṃskṛta Grammar works are written in Saṃskṛta.12.Saṃskṛta *Chandaśśāstra* works describe non-Saṃskṛta metres.13.Some Saṃskṛta authors employed non-Saṃskṛta metres. 14.Translating Saṃskṛta works to non-Saṃskṛta languages is age-old practice. 15. Saṃskṛta translation from non-Saṃskṛta languages is not strange thing to Saṃskṛta scholars.

*Pūrvapakṣa:* Indian Kings were encouraging only Saṃskṛta scholars who were always seeing non- Saṃskṛta languages with disdain. Saṃskṛta scholars were very rich. That Saṃskṛta became supreme language in India is

because of nexus between Saṃskṛta scholars and Kings. In other words growth of Saṃskṛta in India was not natural. It grew by oppressing non-Saṃskṛta languages. Calling Saṃskṛta as *Devabhāṣā* is unmistakable evidence of superiority complex of Saṃskṛta scholars.

*Hetu*: Saṃskṛta literature is full of sycophancy of kings. The statement, *pratyakṣaram lakṣam dadau*(remunerated one lakh rupees per single letter) regarding Bhoja's gifting munificently to the Saṃskṛta poets for their creativity mentioned in Ballālasena's (17<sup>th</sup> century)*Bhojaprabandha* can not be put aside, albeit it is over-exaggeration. If we will read between the lines, this statement gives us a clear picture: Poets/scholars were attracted to Saṃskṛta for its promising financial benefits.

*Siddhānta*: Indian Kings were patronizing not only Saṃskṛta scholars/poets but also scholars/poets of non-Saṃskṛta languages. Except for some isolated cases, Saṃskṛta scholars respect non-Saṃskṛta languages. By and large, Saṃskṛta scholars were not so rich as one may think. Growth of Saṃskṛta in India was caused by its inner stamina. It did not oppress any non-Saṃskṛta language. Every nook and corner of India created Saṃskṛta literature. (It is not seen in non-Saṃskṛta literature. Tamilu literature was not created in Gujarat, best works of Bengali were not created in Karnataka, so on and so forth.) It is one reason among several reasons which generated supremacy of Saṃskṛta. Calling Saṃskṛta as *Devabhāṣā* shows love towards it and nothing else. People show their love towards their mother tongues in so many ways.

*Hetu*: There are so many *hetus* to prove it. I will list only fourteen here.

1.Many Samskr̥ta scholars/poets were not patronized by any king.

A.Vedānta Deśika(1268-1370), staunch advocate of Viśiṣṭādvaita, author of several big volumes and poet was not patronized by any King. It is said of him that he composed the following verse rejecting the proposal to become a poet laureate in a palace.

“That, making sycophancy of the kings who are full of arrogance because of their being rulers to the tiny part of the earth is not a matter of pride. We want to serve the lord who, being pleased by offering of beaten rice, transformed Kucela into Kubera.”

[kṣoṇī-koṇa-śatāmśa-pālanakalā-durvāra-garvāgraha-  
kṣubhyat-kṣudra-narendra-cātu-racanām dhanyām na  
manyāmahe /

devaṁ sevitumeva niścinumāhe yo'sau dayāluḥ purā  
dhānāmuṣṭimuce kucelamunaye dhatte sma vitteśatām  
//]

According to some, this verse is authored by Uddaṇḍaśāstrin of Kāñcī (15<sup>th</sup> century) and not Vedāntadeśika. Whether the author of this verse transformed his poverty into riches by worshipping Śrīkr̥ṣṇa we do not know. If we will read between the lines, we clearly find out self pride and refuse to fawn in front of kings.

B.RāghavendraTīrtha(1595-1671), commentator of *Daśaprakaraṇas* of Madhvācārya(1238-1317), commentator of *Tarkatāṇḍava* of Vyāsatīrtha and author of other works was not patronized by any King.

Instances of *Samnyāsins*' having encouragement of the kings are rare. In most of the cases, *Samnyāsins* , the

authors of Śāstric works did not have any direct contact with the kings.

2.Sometimes the kings got angry with Saṁskṛta scholars/ became indifferent to the scholars.

A.Pradhāni Venkappayya or Venkāmatya(c.1770), author of several works in Saṁskṛta (and Kannada too) was Diwan of Hider Ali(1721-1782). All of a sudden, Hider Ali

“deprived him(=Venkāmatya) of his office, in 1779 on the ground of alleged misuse of power and forced him to make good revenues to the extent of 60,thousand *varahas*, and after that sum had been collected from him, he was insulted and thrown into prison in Seringapatam (=Srirangapattana), his authority being withdrawn..... At the intercession of Appaji Ram, he was however, released from prison, and summoned for military service, but died of diabetes before joining, in November 1772..... The charges trumped up against him -misuse of power and failure to collect revenue- were both unjust and incapable of proof. The object of preferring them was to put him out of the way for he had grown big and may prove another Khande Rao”.(History of Mysore Vol II by C.Hayavadana Rao 1946 Pp.480-481)

B.Nālvāḍi Kṛṣṇarāja Ōḍēyar(4.6.1884-1930) was lover of Kannada. He told Mysore Vāsudevācārya(28.5.1865-17.5.1961), musician and composer of music compositions to compose musical *kṛtis* in Kannada. But M. Vāsudevācārya politely refused by saying that he was not able to do the same as he was accustomed to compose *kṛtis* either in Telugu or Saṁskṛta. An interesting thing here is his mother

tongue was Kannada! The king was upset. He determined to get *kṛtis* composed in Kannada by a non-Kannada musician. So he told Muttayya Bhagavata(15.11.1877-30.6.1945), a Tamilu musician to compose *kṛtis* in Kannada. Muttayya Bhagavata requested the king to allow him to take help of others. Being permitted, he approached one Devottama Bhagavata for creation of Kannada *kṛtis*. Devottama Bhagavata created *kṛtis* and Muttayya Bhagavata fixed *Tālas* and employed *Rāgas* to them. Thenceforth, Mysore Vasudevachar got less salary whereas Bidaram Krsnappa, junior musician got more.(Heard from Mahamahopadhyaya Dr.R.Sathyanarayana).

3.The cases are not rare where Samskr̥ta poets expressed their displeasure regarding the behavior of the kings.

A.Bāṇa(First half of 7<sup>th</sup> century),says in his famous lengthy *Śukanāsopadeśa*, a part of *Kādambarī* :

“ Blind are the kings who are in agitated confusion due to the madness caused by the fever of pride”

[*ahaṅkāradāhajvaramūrchāndhakāritā hi rājaprakṛtiḥ* ]

B.Kalhaṇa (c.12<sup>th</sup> century)says in his *RājaTaraṅgiṇī*

“First, the elephants get purified by taking bath in waterfalls. At the very next moment they become muddy because of their habit of applying dust on their bodies. Strangely the kings are like the elephants, who, in the initial days of their reign, very chaste and obtain fame. But alas, they will become dirty, as, they will get immersed in bad habits. ”

[*citram nṛpadvipāḥ pūtamūrtayaḥ kīrtinirjharaiḥ/  
bhavanti vyasanāsaktipāmsusnānamalīmasaḥ* //]

(Quoted in *Samskṛta Bhāṣāsāstra mattu Sāhitya caritrē* by K.Krishnamoorthy, N.RanganathaSharma and H.K.Siddhagangayya)

4.All the Samskr̥ta poets were not rich. Poverty of Samskr̥ta scholars is well-known.

A.Jagannātha (1590)says in his *Bhāminīvilāsa*.

“O God! The wealth is hoarded in the houses of the wicked. Poverty is making sound among the Brahmins. I got enraged by seeing this kind of your unfair policy. But what can I do? I am in helpless condition and you are supreme ruler.”

[*bhūtir nīcagrheṣu viprasadane dāridryakolāhalo  
nāśo hanta satām asatpathajuṣām āyuh śatānām śatam /  
durnītim tava vīkṣya kopadahana jvālājaṭālo’pi san  
kim kurve jagadīśa! yat punaraham dīno bhavān  
īśvaraḥ//* ]

B.In his *Vānmaṇḍanaḡaṇadūta*, Vīreśvara(date?), requests his *sūkta(ti?)ḡaṇa* (poetic quality) to be his messenger.

“ I am *vaiyākaraṇa*, *kavi*, *vedajña* and able to teach *nāṭakas*. I confess that I got disappointed by the kings who were approached for financial support. They were indifferent to my knowledge. I wish, my *sūkta(ti?)ḡaṇa* (poetic merit)will reach the ears of Bhīmarāja, king of Kāmarūpa, who is great patron of *kāvyaśāstrajñas*.”

[*āste yadyapi pāṇinīyapara(ṭu)tā, kāvyeṣu sarvaṅkaṣā  
sphūrtir nāṭakapāṭhanaiikapatutā vede’pi kaścicchramah /  
teṣveteṣvatidūravartinṛpatipraudhaprasaṅgodyame*

*bhrātaḥ! sūkta(ti?)guṇa! tvameva nipuṇastvāmeva tat  
prārthaye //*

*bhratar!bhūvalaye mayeva bhavatā bhūpaprasaṅgodyameṣu  
āyāso'dhigataḥ punaḥ punaraho nārthaḥ samāsāditāḥ /  
asmādeva vadāmi kiñcana vipaddhvaṁsaikadhuryaṁ vacaḥ  
satyaṁ tat paribhāvya sādaratayā sambhāvanīyaṁ tvayā //  
bandho, kāvya! vasundharādhipatayo ye ye tvayā vīkṣitās  
teṣāṁ pratyayato nirudyamatayā sthātum na te yujyate /  
etaṁ viṣṇumivākhilam tribhuvanam samveṣṭayantīm puraḥ  
kim no paśyasi kāmārūpanṛpateḥ kīrtim tvaduttejikām? //  
daridryeṇa parābhavaḥ kṣititale mayyeva vistāryate  
tvaṁ dāridryavidāraṇaikaarasikaḥ sarvatra ca śrūyase /  
rājanyo'si vadānyavarya bhavatā pālyo'smi ca brāhmaṇo  
matveti kṣitipāladhurya hṛdaye yad yujyate tat kuru //*  
(2,3,4,99)]

C.If all the Samskr̥ta scholars were rich they  
would not have written in the following way:

a.“ Oh! Poverty! I bow down to you. I have become  
achiever of supernatural powers because of your favour, as, I  
see the whole world, but, alas ! nobody sees me.”

*[bho dāridrya namastubhyaṁ siddho'ham  
tvatprasādataḥ /*

*paśyāmyaḥ jagat sarvaṁ mām na paśyati kaścana//]*  
(frequently quoted in collections of *subhāṣitas*)

b.“Don't worry. The one who can make swans white,  
parrots green, peacocks of variegated colours can create a  
job for you”.

*[yena śuklīkṛtā haṁsāḥ śukāśca haritīkṛtāḥ /*

*mayūrāścītrītā yena sa te vṛttim vidhāsyati//*] (quoted in *Hitopadeśa* of Nārāyaṇapaṇḍita who flourished during the reign of kings of Pāla dynasty(8<sup>th</sup> -12<sup>th</sup> century).

5.Many Saṃskṛta scholars composed works in non-Saṃskṛta languages.

A. Vedānta Deśika (1268-1370) wrote books not only in Saṃskṛta but also Tamiḷ. He summarized *Tiru-vāy-mōḷi* in two Saṃskṛta works, *dramiḍopaniṣatsāra* and *dramiḍopaniṣattātparyaratnavālī*.

B. Venkamatya composed works not only in Saṃskṛta but also Kannada. His work in Kannada is *Rāmāyaṇa* in *Vārdhakaṣaṭpadi* metre.

6. Some kings patronized only non-Saṃskṛta poets.

*Cālukya* king Arikesarin II(First half of 10<sup>th</sup> century) did not patronize any Saṃskṛta poet who patronized only Kannada *Ādikavi* Pampa(902-975).

7.We can not say that sycophantic statements centering on kings available only in Saṃskṛta. They are found even in the works of non-Saṃskṛta languages. The following piece praise of king in Kannada vouches it:

“This king can be compared to Nala, Manmatha, Jayanta, Nalakūbara and Viṣṇu in beauty; Bhīma,Arjuna Paraśurāma and Rāma in strength and Bali; Māndhātṛ, Dadhīci and Karṇa in munificence-and hence, shines gloriously.”

[*naḷa kandarpa jayanta kūbaranupendraṅgīḍu*  
*saundaryadōḷ*  
*balabhīmārjunabhārgaveśaraghurāmaṅgīḍu sāmārthyadōḷ*  
*balimāndhātadadhīcīkarṇakhacarendraṅgīḍudāratvadōḷ*



*cēluvum bīramu cāgamum nēlēsiral tānōppidam būhmipam*  
// ](Quoted in *Kāvyaśāra*, compiled by Mallakavi 5.195 )

8.If we take the expression *saṃskṛtaṃ devabhāṣā* as Saṃskṛta-loving expression, it can be justified by comparing the expressions *Tamiḷutāyi* of Tamilu people, *Kannaḍamma* or *Kannaḍabhuvaneśvari* of Kannada people, *Vaṅgamātā* of Bengali people so on and so forth. All the Indian languages have created self glorifying songs composed by modern poets. Songs like “Be anywhere. Be under any circumstances. Always be Kannada person. ” [ *ēllādaru iru ēntādaru iru ēndēndigu nī kannaḍavāgīru*] and “Beat Kannada drum”[*bārisu kannaḍa diṇḍimava*] composed by Kuvempu(29.12.1904-9.11.1994) are very popular. Nobody says that Kuvempu shows hatred towards non-Kannada languages. Being such a case, what offence Bommalapura Venkataram Bhat(1.1.1915-30.12.1991) has committed by composing the song *nādaya saṃskṛtabherīm* ? Can’t we see the expression *saṃskṛtaṃ devabhāṣā* in the same vein? Why shall we assume it as anti-non-Saṃskṛta slogan? At the same time I refrain to advocate the guy who wrote *sarvatra pāmarī bhāṣā sūkarīva gr̥he gr̥he/ kvacidevāmarī bhāṣā cāmarīva surālaye* // which is obviously of *kūpamaṇḍūkatva*.

Personally I do not believe that Saṃskṛta is not language of gods. But a separate article will be required to deny this popular statement. I will write an article on the same shortly.

9.Statements of praising Non-Saṃskṛta languages/styles/works are available aplenty in old literature. These are of two kinds: a.Statements in non Saṃskṛta languages. b. Statements in Saṃskṛta itself.

a.Statements in non Saṃskṛta languages.

1.Rājaśekhara(first half of 10<sup>th</sup> century) says:  
“Style of Saṃskṛta is harsh. But style of Prākṛta is cushy. ”  
[*parusā sakkaā bandhā pāūa bandho vi ho ī*  
*suūmāro/(Karpūramañjarī1.7)*]

2.Kṛṣṇadevarāya(1509–1530) proclaims in his  
*Āmuktamālyada* that, “Telugu is super among all the  
vernacular languages”[*deśabhāṣalandu Tēlugu lēssa.*]

3.Mahalingaraṅga(1675) says in his *Anubhavāmṛta* “Is  
it not enough to achieve ultimate salvation of self by  
understanding advice written in simple Kannada that can be  
compared to the banana fruit with its skin peeled, sugarcane  
with its outer coat removed and the milk which is cold. What  
else one can expect from Saṃskṛta? ”

[*sulida bālēya haṇṇinandadi kalēda sigurina*  
*kabbinandadalalida uṣṇada hālinandadi*  
*sulabhavāgirpa/lalitavaha kannadaḍa nuḍiyali tiḷidu*  
*tannōlu tanna mokṣava gaḷisikōṇḍarē sālade*  
*saṃskṛtadōḷinnenu ? // (1.5)*]

b.Statements in Saṃskṛta itself.

1.It is said of Appayya Dīkṣita(1553-1626) that  
once he declared that “Being Telugu man, having Telugu as  
mother tongue, taking birth in Telugu country, study of  
*Prābhākara Mīmāṃsā*, possessing the tradition of reciting  
*Yajurveda*-these achievements are not results of ordinary  
*tapas.*” [*āndhratvam āndhrabhāṣā ca prābhākara*  
*parīśramaḥ / tatrāpi yājuṣī śākhā nālpasya tapasaḥ phalam//*]

2.Kṣemendra(990-1070)says in his  
*Kavikaṇṭhābharāṇa*: “The one who wants to become poet  
must listen recitation of melodious *Kāvya*s composed in non-  
Saṃskṛta languages.”[*gīteṣu gāthāsvatha deśabhāṣā*  
*kāvyēṣu dadyāt saraseṣu karṇam(1.17)*]

10. Some scholars were of the view that we have to respect all the languages without leaning towards any single language.

A. This is the *Maṅgala śloka* of *Karṇāṭaka Bhāṣā Bhūṣaṇa* by Nāgavarman (mid-11th or mid-12th century):  
*sarvajñaṁ tadahaṁ vande paraṁ jyotiḥ tamopaham /  
pravṛttā yanmukhād devī sarvabhāṣāsarasvatī //*

“I bow down to omniscient and supreme light that dispels darkness. From this very light, the goddess namely Sarasvatī of all the languages got radiated. ”

B. Hemacandra (1089-1172) in *Kāvyaṇuśāsana-viveka*: “The language Ardhamāgadhī belongs to Bhagavant. It is single. It simply gets changed according to the locus. This transformation may be compared to the water that comes out from the cloud takes shelter in several forms. Hence, the following statement (in *Mahāpurāṇa*): Gods, (educated) human beings, hunters, and animals think that their languages got emerged from the Bhagavant, the supreme being. ”  
*[ekarūpāpi hi bhagavato’rdhamāgadhī bhāṣā  
vāridavimuktavārivat āśryānurpatayā pariṇamati / yadāha-  
devā daivīm narā nārīm śabarāścāpi śābarīm /  
tiryāṅco’pi ca tairāścīm menire bhagavadgiram // ]*

C. Akalaṅka (1604) in *Karṇāṭakaśabdānuśāsana*: “I bow down to Śrī Vardhamāna, the publisher of universal knowledge. The language, which comprises all languages has sprung from his lotus-face. ”

*[namaḥ śrī vardhamānāya viśvavidyāvabhāṣine /  
sarvabhāṣāmayī bhāṣā pravṛttā yanmukhāmbujāt //]*

The following is an extract from the *Mañjarī-makaranda*, commentary on the same by Bhaṭṭākalaṅka (1604):

“Question: Is it correct to say that single divine language possesses many languages? Answer: Yes, correct. This is incomprehensible greatness of divine voice. This is like the water which is one and without any variety rained down from the sky in the rainy season. Its flavor is not manifested . But when it falls on lands of salt, black, drain it tastes salt, sweet , astringent etc.

“Even the words of Kannada shall be instructed like the words of Saṁskṛta as they can be instructed and they are subject to analysis of correct and wrong forms. If it is not so, how can the language of Bhagavant comprise it? It(=Kannada) is not made of only wrong forms....Neither it is useless for writing Śāstras - as, it possesses not only *Mahāśāstra* namely *Cūdāmaṇi* with 96000 *granthas* but also *kāvya*s, *nāṭakas*, *alaṅkāras*, works on *kalāśāstra*. So this language shall be taken by *Mahājanas*. ”

[*nanu ekasyā eva bhagavadvāṅyāḥ*  
*nānābhāṣātmakatvaṁ kathamupapadyata iti cet*  
*divyadhvanerayamacintyamahimā svabhāvaḥ / yathā*  
*prāvṛṭkāle nabhaḥsthalātpatitamāntarikṣaṁ jalam*  
*ekamavyaktarasamapi lavaṇakṛṣṇoṣarādikṣetragataṁ sat*  
*tadeva lavaṇamadhurakaṣāyabhedabhinnam*  
*nānātmakamanubhūyate /*

*yathā saṁskṛtaśabdāḥ sādhuvasādhuvivecanaviṣayatayā*  
*anuśāsanārthāḥ tathā bhāṣāśabdā api / yadi ca amī*  
*nānuśāsyāḥ katham tarhi bhagavdbhāṣā tanmayī syāt / na*  
*hyapaśabdamayī sā / ..... na caiṣā bhāṣā śāstrānupayoginī*  
*tattvārthaśāstramahā-vyākhyānasya ṣaṇṇavatisahasra*  
*pramita-granthasandarbhā-rūpasya cūdāmaṇyabhidhāna-*  
*sya mahāśātrasya anyeṣāṁ ca śabdāgamayukty-*  
*āgamaviṣayāṇāṁ tathā kāvyanāṭak-ālaṅkāra-kalāśāstra-*  
*viṣayāṇāṁ ca bahūnāṁ granthānāmapi bhāṣākṛtānāmāpy-*  
*upalabhyamānatvāt / ata eva mahājanapari-grāhyā.*  
*etadgranthakartṛṇāmeva mahājanatvāt.]*

Educated people/ scholars/authors are meant by the word *Mahājanas* here. Obviously the author is arguing that Kannada is not only language of the masses, it is *Paṇḍita-bhāṣā* too !

11.Non-Saṃskṛta Grammar works are written in Saṃskṛta.

*A.Prākṛta*

*a.Prākṛtaprakāśa* by Vararuci

*b.Prākṛtaśabdnuśāsana* by Trivikrama(13<sup>th</sup> century)

*c.Prākṛtasarvasva* by Mārkaṇḍeya(17<sup>th</sup> century)

*d.Prākṛta section of Siddha-hema-śabdnuśāsana* by Hemacandrae.

*e.Prākṛta-vyākaraṇa-sūtrāṇi* ascribed to one Vālmiki

*f.Ṣaḍbhāṣācandrikā* by Lakṣmīdhara.

*B.Other:*

*a.Karnāṭakabhāṣābhūṣaṇa* by Nāgavarman(c.1150)

*b.Karnāṭakaśabdānuśāsana* by Bhaṭṭa Akalaṅka(c.1604)

*c.Āndhraśabdacintāmaṇi* by Nannaya(11cent.)

*d.Līlātilaka*(Malayalam grammar.It has a commentary in Malayalam but the original is in Saṃskṛta itself)

*e.Mahārāṣṭra-prayoga-candrikā.*

*f.Kāṣmīraśabdāmṛta*

12.Saṃskṛta *Chandaśśāstra* works describe non-Saṃskṛta metres.

Jayakīrti(1000) defines some Kannada metres like *tripadi*, *eḷe* in his *Chando'nuśāsana*. SomeśvaraIII(1127) describes some Kannada metres like *kanda* in his (*Rāja*) *Mānasollasa* ( *vinodavimśati-gītavinoda* 292). *Vāṇībhūṣaṇa*

of Dāmodaramiśra(15<sup>th</sup> century?) defines some non-Saṃskṛta metres like *dohā*, *caupaiyā*, *kuṇḍalikā* etc.

13. Some Saṃskṛta authors employed non-Saṃskṛta metres in their Saṃskṛta works. Bhatta shri Mathuranatha Shastri (1889-1960?) applied metres like *Caupai*, *Soraṭhā* etc of Vraj language in his works *Jayapuravaibhava*, *Sāhityavaibhava* and *Govindavaibhava*. Bommalapura Venkataram Bhat(1.1.1915-30.12.1991) employed pure Kannada metres like *Bhāminiṣaṭpadi*, *Vārdhakaṣaṭpadi* in his works. (*Mohanāyana*-is *Mahākāvya* on life History of Mahatma Gandhi. *Bhāminīmādhava*- is *Mahākāvya* on Śrīkrṣṇa. *Satyaviyaya*-is *Nāṭaka* on Satyahariścandra). He skillfully used *Govinahāḍina maṭṭu* in his *Puṇyakoti-kathā* (Saṃskṛta translation of *Govina hāḍu*). This *Govinahāḍina maṭṭu* is almost half of *Bhāminiṣaṭpadi*. Some scholars tried to coin a new name for it: *Arē Bhāmini*(half *Bhāmini*) But this name is not popular.

Dr.Sadasiva Murty Rani, Professor at Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha has informed me that he has successfully employed Telugu metres in some of his Saṃskṛta works.

14. Translating Saṃskṛta works to non-Saṃskṛta languages is age-old practice. I refrain from giving examples here. All the non-Saṃskṛta languages of our country are full of translations of *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Mahābhārata*, *Purāṇas*, philosophical works, so on and so forth. Here one may cite a famous(humorous to some extent) statement of Kumāra-vyāsa(1430), author of *Karṇāṭabhāratakathāmañjarī* popularly known as *Kumāravāyāsabhārata: tiṇukidanu phaṇirāya rāmāyaṇada kavigaḷa bhāradali tintiṇiya raghuvaracaritēyali kāliḍalu tērapilla* (1.1.17). [Ādiśeṣa struggled a lot to hold the earth as it became very heavy because of weight of *Rāmāyaṇa* authors. This density of life

of Śrīrāma does not allow one to step in. So, I am taking *Mahābhārata* for translation and not *Rāmāyaṇa*.]

15. Saṃskṛta translation from non-Saṃskṛta languages is not strange thing to Saṃskṛta scholars. It requires a separate volume to list all the names of the same. Let me cite only one example: 2500 Kannada *Vacanas* are translated into Saṃskṛta by eight scholars recently (Pub. Basavabhavana, Bangalore.2011).

*Nigamana*: That Saṃskṛta scholars/writers always view non-Saṃskṛta languages with disdain is nothing but nonsense. Except for some isolated cases, Saṃskṛta scholars do respect non-Saṃskṛta languages. Theorizing on nexus between Saṃskṛta scholars and the kings for prevailing of Saṃskṛta is unfounded.

P.S. Saṃskṛta students in the areas of Hindi belt do know *Tulsī Rāmāyaṇ*. Here, inclusion of *Tulsī Rāmāyaṇ* in Saṃskṛta education system is the reason. But in the areas of Kannada belt, Saṃskṛta students, particularly youngsters do not know anything of *Tōravē Rāmāyaṇa*. Non-existence of state languages in Saṃskṛta education is common everywhere in India, except Hindi belt. If Saṃskṛta education (particularly in *Pāṭhaśālās*) will include classic works of state languages, ignorance regarding the actual relation between Saṃskṛta and non-Saṃskṛta will be minimized to a great extent.

## **Acknowledgements:**

I am grateful to Sri S.Kartik for informing me the different authors of *Karṇāṭakaśabdānuśāsāna* and *Mañjarī-makaranda* and sending me *History of Mysore* by C.Hayavadana Rao.

I am grateful to Pro. Ashok Aklujkar for informing me on *Mahārāṣṭra-prayoga-candrikā*

**©S.Jagannatha, Mysore**

**jgrantha@gmail.com**